

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Advisory Action mailed October 29, 2008 and the Final Office Action mailed August 18, 2008 and offers the following remarks to accompany the above amendments and the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,043,569 B1 to Chou et al. (hereinafter “Chou”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,000,052 B2 to Moon et al. (hereinafter “Moon”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. To establish *prima facie* obviousness, the Patent Office must show where each and every element of the claim is taught or suggested in the combination of references. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. If the Patent Office cannot establish obviousness, the claims are allowable.

Applicant maintains its arguments from the previous responses that the combination of Chou and Moon does not teach or suggest adaptive interconnect logic adapted to: “i) negotiate with a module over a control path via one of the plurality of module interfaces to identify an interface personality for the module; ii) select the interface personality based on negotiations with the module; and iii) apply the interface personality to the one of the plurality of module interfaces,” as recited in claim 1 (see Response filed July 15, 2008, pp. 3-7; Response filed October 17, 2008, pp. 3-7). Neither Chou nor Moon teaches or suggests the claimed interface personality.

However, in an effort to advance prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to make explicit that the interface personality that is applied to the one of the plurality of module interfaces provides an appropriate interconnection between the control system interface and the one of the plurality of module interfaces via a plurality of pins. Claim 7 has been amended in a similar fashion. New claims 13-20 have been added to further define the claimed invention. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the Specification, including at least paragraphs 0004, 0013, 0015, 0018, and 0020. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments.

The combination of Chou and Moon fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 7 as amended. In particular, the combination of Chou and Moon does not teach or suggest that the interface personality that is applied to the one of the plurality of module interfaces provides an appropriate interconnection between the control system interface and the one of the plurality of module interfaces via a plurality of pins, as recited in amended claims 1

and 7. Neither Chou nor Moon mentions that an appropriate interconnection is provided by the interface personality between the control system interface and the one of the plurality of module interfaces via a plurality of pins. In fact, both Chou and Moon fail to disclose any plurality of pins. The configuration data in Chou is not applied to provide an appropriate interconnection between the control system interface and the one of the plurality of module interfaces via a plurality of pins. Likewise, the configuration parameter in Moon merely discloses a configuration parameter which is used to identify an aspect of the input/output card to the end user (Moon, col. 1, lines 50-55). The configuration parameter of Moon simply does not establish an interconnection of any sort between the claimed control system and the claimed module interface, much less provide an appropriate interconnection between the control system interface and the one of the plurality of module interfaces via a plurality of pins. Thus, the combination of Chou and Moon does not teach each and every element of independent claims 1 and 7 as amended. Claims 1 and 7 are therefore patentable.


Claims 2-6 and 8-12 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and contain all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Thus, claims 2-6 and 8-12 are patentable based on their dependency from claims 1 and 7.

In addition, new claims 13-16 and 17-20 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and contain all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Thus, claims 13-16 and 17-20 are patentable based on their dependency from claims 1 and 7. In addition, each of claims 13-20 recites additional limitations not found in either Chou or Moon. For example, neither Chou nor Moon teaches or suggests a plurality of pins, wherein the plurality of pins include power pins, control pins, and datapath pins, as recited in claims 13 and 17. Likewise, neither Chou nor Moon teaches or suggests that the negotiations between the adaptive interconnect logic and the module are done using the control pins, as recited in claims 14 and 18. Finally, neither Chou nor Moon teaches or suggests that the claimed interface personality further defines signal levels (see claims 15 and 19) or an acceptable protocol for communications (see claims 16 and 20) with the module. Thus, claims 13-20 are further patentable for the above reasons.

The present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:


John R. Witcher, III
Registration No. 39,877
100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: November 18, 2008
Attorney Docket: 7000-248